DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 331 057 CS 212 762

AUTHOR Stotsky, Sandra
TITLE Does a Literary Canon Exist in Our Secondary Schools? Or How Many Students Need To Read the Same Body of Works before It Can be Called a Literary Canon?
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Education; *English Curriculum; English Instruction; Literature Appreciation; Reading Material Selection; Reading Research; Secondary Education; *Secondary School Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS Cultural Literacy; *Literary Canon; Reading Lists

ABSTRACT

For a number of years, charges have flown back and forth about the presence or absence of a literary canon in the secondary schools. A review of surveys, done over the past century, of the literary works teachers say they have assigned their students, shows that only four authors from the 1907 list are present on the 1990 list. There does not seem to be any strong evidence for the existence of a canon in high school literature programs over the past century if what is meant by a canon is a group of literary works remaining essentially unchanged from decade to decade. If a canon means, however, that the majority of students in this country have been exposed to a relatively small body of literary works, the evidence is not clear. Lists of works read across schools do not tell how many of these works an individual student is apt to have read. Probably the most valid way to determine the existence and nature of a supposed literary canon is to compile not what the most frequently assigned works across schools or classes are but what individual students are reading within and across schools. The trends discerned in comparing the results of these surveys raise a number of questions for English teachers to discuss, including questions about the intellectual and moral content of readings as well as the civic mission of the schools. (Four tables of data are included.) (TD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED331057

Does a Literary Canon Exist in Our Secondary Schools? Or How Many Students Need to Read the Same Body of Works Before It Can be Called a Literary Canon?

Sandra Stotsky

Harvard Graduate School of Education

Paper Presented at the

American Educational Research Association

1991 Spring Conference

Chicago, Illinois

CS212762

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra Stotsky

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

For a number of years, charges have flown back and forth about the presence or absence of a literary canon in the secondary schools. Some scholars and researchers have claimed that the literature curriculum in the secondary schools has hardly changed since the turn of the century. This charge often implies that most English teachers are stodgy, conservative folk clinging to "standard literary works" or "great books." A more charitable implication of this charge is that English teachers have been under the dictatorial thumb of "reactionary" school committees or communities and have been unable to select newer works or works outside the presumed canon. Regardless of why this presumed literary canon exists, its existence would clearly mean that most secondary school students have been confined to the study of the same body of literary texts over the years.

On the other hand, other scholars and researchers have suggested that the nation's students are no longer being exposed to enough similar cultural content to be able as adults to engage together in meaningful public discourse. According to this view of the secondary school literature curriculum, today's young voters will have little shared information and common ground for promoting the common good when addressing social issues. That is essentially the argument made by E.D. Hirsch Jr. in Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs To Know (1987) with respect to literature and reading programs in grades K-8, and is part of the rationale for Mortimer Adler's Paedeia Program (1984). And, in fact, a few researchers have even gathered some evidence that might support the claim that students are not developing common cultural knowledge. Arthur Applebee, Judith Langer, and Ina Mullis (1987), using data obtained by the Educational Testing Service for a study sponsored by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), and Diane Ravitch and Chester Finn (1987), using the same data for their nation-wide assessment of literature and

history, both found the average score on literature knowledge in high school juniors to be about 50%. That is, only a bare majority of high school students knew, on the average, about half of what was assessed in these studies. Such findings can be interpreted at least two ways. Possibly students have not learned as much from their school studies as English teachers would hope they had. Or a large number of them have not been exposed to the literature used by ETS in both studies to assess cultural knowledge.

I offer here a synthesis of the results of surveys, done over the past century, of the literary works teachers say they have assigned their students. What do these studies tell us about the inflexibility of the high school literature curriculum through the years? What trends do they show? Do these results support the contention that secondary school literature programs have offered, and continue to offer, what could be construed as a literary canon, a relatively small body of literary texts to which a majority of our students have been, and are continuing to be, exposed?

Studies of What English Teachers Assign or Students Read

The first survey in this century to present tabled data was conducted for the English profession by George Tanner and published in 1907. Tanner reported on information he gathered from 67 high schools, grades 9-12, in the Middle West. Table 1 is a reproduction of the table in his report. The list he compiled is heavily British; of the 40 most frequently assigned works, only 9 are by American authors; they are Washington Irving, James Russell Lowell, Edgar Allen Poe, Nathaniel Hawthorne, James Fenimore Cooper, John Greenleaf Whittier, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. There are few contemporary works on the list, whether essays, poems, plays, or novels. Many of the novels could be considered adventure stories (e.g., Ivanhoe, Last of the Mohicans, Treasure Island); few protagonists, however, are adolescents. There is little humor in

the list (Washington Irving's Sketch Book may be the chief example). But there is a great deal of poetry, for example, works by Shakespeare, Homer, Milton, Coleridge, Tennyson, Burns, and Browning. It is clearly a list for able readers. I shall use this list as a baseline with which to compare later lists.

In 1950, George Norvell, a supervisor of English in New York State, published an extensive report of students' reading interests. His report does not inform us about the frequency with which literary selections were assigned in New York State during the 1940s, simply how popular 1700 reading selections were to thousands of students in grades 7-12 throughout the state. Norvell obtained *popularity* ratings for a title from at least 300 students before he placed it on his list; for *many* titles, Norvell received thousands of ratings. Data from 50,000 students were collected for Norvell by 625 teachers, who indicated their students' reading ability and verified the fact that the titles mentioned by the students had been read or studied in school. The value of Norvell's study (which is not the only study of student reading interests but seems to be the *largest*) is that it offers a comprehensive picture of the range of reading material studied or read by secondary school students in the 1940s.

One of Norvell's concerns was the extent to which literature curricula favored girls' interests *more* than boys. He found that the reading materials commonly used in literature classes were better liked by girls than by boys in a ratio of more than two to one. He suggested that "if boys are to be given a fair chance to develop the reading habit, a major revision must be made in the materials studied in school" (p. 6). Interestingly, he found little difference in favorites between top readers and poor readers; he noted a "remarkably close correspondence between the reading interests of superior, average, and weak pupils" (p. 27). He concluded that content not reading difficulty was a "major determinant of reading interests" (p. 27). Norvell found a number of works in the curriculum unpopular with students, such as Edmund Burke's "Speech on Con-

ciliation with the American Colonies," The Vicar of Wakefield, and Macaulay's Life of Johnson. But he also found many classics highly popular with students, such as Macbeth, Hamlet, Silas Marner, David Copperfield, Treasure Island, "Old Ironsides," "The Barefoot Boy," "Paul Revere's Ride," "The Deacon's Masterpiece," "A Dissertation upon Roast Pig." It is worth noting that in grades 10-12, half of the top 12 works of fiction liked by girls were by female authors, suggesting that by the 1940s a number of works by female authors were already studied or read in school.

A nation-wide survey was conducted by Scarvia Anderson in 1964 for the Educational Testing Service. Table 2 displays the top 42 works assigned by 5% or more of public schools, grades 7-12, as generalized from her data from 222 representative schools and 7121 classrooms in these schools. This list is still heavily British, but 18 American authors are on it. A number of works now have adolescent protagonists (e.g., The Pearl, Romeo and Juliet, Tom Sawyer, Huckleberry Finn, Treasure Island, The Yearling, Johnny Tremain, Great Expectations, To Kill a Mockingbird), in part a reflection of the literature used in grades 7 and 8. The list contains some poetry (works by Shakespeare, Longfellow, Tennyson, Homer, Milton), and humor appears in some works (for example, Cyrano de Bergerac or The Adventures of Tom Sawyer). We also find a number of works featuring a woman as a central focus or character (for example, The Barretts of Wimpole Street, Evangeline, Jane Eyre, The King and I, Pride and Prejudice, She Stoops to Conquer, Pygmalion, The Scarlet Letter). There are some distinctly contemporary works, such as To Kill a Mockingbird, The Yearling, and The Pearl. Only 12 of these 42 titles are on Tanner's 1907 list, although there are more works by Shakespeare and Dickens on the 1964 list than on the 1907 list.

Arthur Applebee (1989) conducted the most recent nation-wide survey, closely following the methodology used in the Anderson study. Table 3 shows the top

43 titles in 5% or more of public schools, grades 7-12, as generalized from the data Applebee collected from 322 representative schools. Of the top 43 titles, 26 are by American authors. About 20 titles reflect contemporary life, and except for Orwell's 1984 and Animal Farm, and Golding's Lord of the Flies, they are by Americans. Many of these works have adolescents as protagonists. Few works contain humor and few could be considered adventure stories. Except for Homer and Shakespeare, there is no poetry on this list. Only 4 of these titles are on Tanner's 1907 list.

In the survey that Philip Anderson and I conducted for the New England Association of Teachers of English (NEATE), reported in The Leaflet in 1990, all secondary school members of NEATE were asked to note on a questionnaire 10 well-known and 10 less well-known titles that they would recommend to their colleagues for whole-class instruction, based on their own experience in teaching these works. Note that the question we asked differed from the question asked in the Anderson and Applebee surveys: we did not ask for what they taught but what they would recommend to others based on what they taught. The impetus for this study was to offer secondary English teachers an opportunity to recommend works of literature to each other, in contrast to NEATE's other published reading lists, which were based on recommendations by college/-university professors in New England for college-bound students and compiled by James Barr, most recently in 1981. The chief limitation of the NEATE study is that it was neither nation-wide nor stratified for representation of different types of schools, as were the Anderson and Applebee studies.

The data reported in the NEATE study came from the 132 secondary school members of NEATE who responded to the survey, a 27% return; about 1/5 taught in grades 7-9, the rest in grades 10-12. For grades 7-9, 32 of the 39 most frequently recommended titles are by Americans. None is on Tanner's 1907 list (which, it should be recalled, did not include grades 7 and 8), and only 8 are

on Anderson's 1964 list. In grades 10-12, 43 of the top 68 titles are by American authors. Only 17 are on Anderson's 1964 list, and only 5 are on Tanner's 1907 list.

To facilitate a closer comparison with Anderson's and Applebee's lists, Table 4 lists the top 45 works for grades 7-12 as rated by these 132 teachers, a composite list that is heavily tilted to senior high school teaching experience because most of the responding teachers are in senior high schools. This list does not look too different from Applebee's list, suggesting that the two studies are capturing reality. In this list, 29 titles are by American authors, and only 5 titles (works by Shakespeare, George Eliot, and Dickens) are on Tanner's 1907 list. There is no poetry except in works by Shakespeare, little humor, few adventure stories, and many works with adolescent protagonists. Many of the most frequently read books are short works without highly advanced vocabularies; they are thus accessible to students with only moderate reading ability.

Summary of Trends

We may discern several trends in these surveys conducted over the past century. First, there is a clear shift from a predominantly British curriculum to a predominantly American one from 1907 to 1990, a major cultural transformation that seems to be virtually unremarked upon in the professional literature. According to the rsults of these surveys, only 4 authors have survived: Shakespeare, Dickens, Hawthorne, and George Eliot. If Norvell's study of students' reading interests in 1950 is a rough indication of what students were studying or encouraged to read by that time, it is possible that major changes in the literature curriculum had taken place by mid-century. By 1964, to judge from Anderson's survey, only 12 titles were on the 1907 list, and almost half of the top 40 or so titles were by Americans. Second, changes

in the curriculum have continued to be made to these mid-century changes; only 18 of the 43 books on Applebee's 1989 survey are on Anderson's 1964 list (a change of 58%), while only 16 of the 45 books on the NEATE survey are on Anderson's list (a change of 64%). Third, many major characters in works of fiction are now adolescents. Fourth, and this point is probably related to the third, many of the top 40 or so titles for grades 7-12 are now suitable for students with moderate reading ability. (We do need to keep in mind the differences between high schools in 1907 and today; the number of students attending high school at the turn of the century was relatively much smaller than today, and most were expected to be able to read the kind of works on Tanner's list.) Finally, depending on how one would classify a work, there seems to be a decline in tales of adventure and humor. There is a clear decline in collections of poems and in serious essays. However, in making comparisons using the Tanner study as a baseline, we also have to keep in mind that Tanner listed individual poems or shorter works, such as Chaucer's Prologue, while Anderson's and Applebee's studies solicited titles of book-length works only. The NEATE study asked for titles of complete individual works, which could have elicited poems or essays but with extremely few exceptions did not.

Do We Have, Or Have We Had, a Literary Canon?

To judge by these lists, there does not seem to be any strong evidence for the existence of a canon in high school literature programs over the past century if by a canon we mean a group of literary works remaining essentially unchanged from decade to decade. A canon of only 4 or 5 authors is hardly a canon, if we use the 1907 study as a baseline and the Applebee or NEATE survey as the current endpoint. While it may be the case that contemporary secondary school anthologies still largely contain works or authors that have always been in school anthologies, nevertheless, the surveys reviewed here clearly indicate

that dramatic changes have taken place during the twentieth century in the major works now read in the schools. If by a canon we also mean that the majority of students in this country have been exposed to a relatively small body of literary works, then the evidence is not at all clear. I shall now suggest why.

Researchers who have collected data on the literary works that teachers assign or that a school's English curriculum mandates usually list the percentages of schools that assign a specific work. But these studies, usually culminating in a list of works most frequently read across schools, do not tell us how many of these works an individual student is apt to have read, or the degree of commonality among groups of students within and across schools in the reading of large numbers of these works. If, for example, 3 different works are taught in 30% of the schools, each could be taught in a different 30% so that only a minority of students (30%) share the experience of reading any one of these 3 works in common. Moreover, the percentage of schools in which a work is assigned is not equivalent to the percentage of classes or students across schools that have read the work.

Anderson's study illustrates this point well. Anderson noted not only the percentage of schools in which a title was studied but also the percentage of classes across schools in which the title was studied. The difference between the two is informative. Anderson collected data from classes in grades 7 to 12 in the 222 school systems in her study. Assuming that a work would not normally be assigned more than once in grades 7-12 in any one school system, this means that a work would have to be assigned in about 17% (one/sixth) of the classes in her survey to reach most students in those school systems. Thus, one might expect a work taught in 50% of all schools to be taught in about 8 and one/half% of all classes. Yet, according to her data, the most frequently reported work, Macbeth, although assigned in 90% of schools, was taught in only

12% of the classes, not 15% to 16%. Other relatively difficult works, such as David Copperfield, Moby Dick, Pygmalion, and Paradise Lost were also taught in a smaller percentage of classes than is suggested by the percentage of schools in which they were assigned. On the other hand, some relatively easier works were taught in fewer schools than the percentage of classes would suggest (Johnny Tremain, The Pearl, and The Yearling, for example) suggesting that these works might have been taught in large *numbers* of classes in the schools that assigned them. In Applebee's study, only the percentage of schools assigning a particular work was reported because he obtained incomplete or unreliable data on the number of classes within the schools in which the works were assigned (1991, personal communication). Thus, from his study we do not know if or how the percentage of classes studying a work differed from the percentage of schools in which it was assigned. One might hazard the generalization that to state the percentage of schools requiring study of a specific work is to overestimate the number of classes across schools that actually study that work. Conversely, it *may* also underestimate the number of classes studying that work in the schools in which it is taught. The number of classes within and across schools studying a title might well provide better evidence about the uniformity or lack of uniformity in secondary school literature programs.

The number of unique titles reported in a study also provides useful information on the degree of variability in titles across classes and schools. Anderson noted that the 222 schools, grades 7-12, in her 1964 survey provided 1000 unique titles. Two tables in Applebee's appendix indicate that almost 800 unique titles were generated by the 322 schools, grades 7-12, in his survey. In the NEATE study, the 132 teachers in the study generated 720 unique titles, only 328 of which were mentioned two or more times, and only 12 of which were mentioned by 20 or more teachers.

Another index of the degree of variability among classrooms, one reflect-

ing the number of unique titles generated in the study, is the number of most frequently mentioned titles across teachers or schools that each individual teacher mentions. In light of the number of unique titles generated by teachers in the NEATE survey, it is not surprising that Stotsky and Anderson found no teacher mentioning more than 14 of the top 45 titles. Only 9% recommended more than 8 of the top 45 titles, and only 30% recommended more than 6 of the top 45 titles. However, since most teachers did not recommend a total of 20 titles (10 in each category), the degree of individuality these percentages suggest is somewhat exaggerated. For 27% of these teachers, over 50% of their total individual recommendations were in the top 45 titles. On the other hand, for 46% of these teachers, only 1/3 to 1/2 of their total individual recommendations were in the top 45 titles mentioned, and for 27% of these teachers, less than 1/3 of their total individual recommendations were in the top 45 titles. If these 132 teachers had each recommended a full complement of 20 titles, there might have been more repetition, more unique titles, or both; we do not know. In any event, the results of the NEATE survey suggest that one teacher's classroom literature program may be quite different from another's, if not from teacher to teacher in a school, then at least from school to school.

Probably the most valid way to determine the existence and nature of a supposed literary canon is to compile not what the most frequently assigned works across schools or classes are but what individual students are reading within and across schools, both for whole-class instruction and for outside reading or book reports. Ideally, we should look at what individual students read over the course of 4 to 6 years.

Concluding Remarks

It is possible that secondary school students in this country now read few literary works in common, and that this has been the case for a long time.

Clearly, some works are read more frequently than others in and across schools, but the number of different works now studied across schools seems to be quite large. The trends one can discern in comparing the results of these few surveys raise a number of questions for English teachers to discuss.

First are questions about intellectual content. Are we in danger of losing our poetic heritage, the influence of the language and ideas of the many nineteenth century British and American poets who have been among the most gifted writers of the English language? Further, are today's students sufficiently exposed to adventure stories or works of humor to stimulate strong reading habits? In addition, are our most able readers studying works of fiction and non-fiction as intellectually complex and as challenging in vocabulary as students 100 years ago studied? Or have we "dumbed down" the literature curriculum for all students in the legitimate effort to accommodate an extremely broad range of high school students? The brevity of, and vocabulary in, many contemporary works raise this concern. Conversely, are we patronizing many less able readers and denying them an opportunity to become acquainted with longer, more thematically complex, and lexically challenging works?

No less important are questions about moral content. Have we distorted or arrested character development in our students by providing excessive exposure to juvenile protagonists in the works they read? Should more characters of intellectual and moral maturity be available as role models in the literature they read? The April, 1989 issue of the English Journal carried an editorial and several articles on this very topic. My concern is not the absence of moral issues but the absence of morally mature characters in contemporary works, of all ethnic and racial groups, whether "white" or "non-white," and of both genders.

The answers to all these questions need to be pursued--by teachers and researchers. As important as it is to know more about how students respond to

what they read, it would be foolish to pretend that intellectual and moral content does not profoundly affect the process and nature of response. Process is inextricably related to content in all areas of life. Theme, plot, character, setting, mood, and literary language itself all influence individual response to literature. While pedagogy always plays some role, what is in a work probably plays the major role in the way in which a literary work affects intellectual and moral development. Strangely, there seems to be almost no research on the influence of intellectual and moral content on the process and nature of response to literature.

Finally, there are questions relating to the civic mission of the schools. What are the civic implications of highly individualistic literature curricula, if they exist nation-wide? If our students have few reading experiences in common, will they as adults be capable of engaging each other in responsible public discourse? Clearly, English teachers must be able to change their literature programs in light of changing tastes and student needs, as they have apparently been doing regularly since the turn of the century. On the other hand, they are also responsible, in a highly multi-religious and multi-ethnic society, for creating and cultivating common ground through the literature they teach in all its many forms.

School literature programs serve civic as well as intellectual, moral, and aesthetic purposes. If the variations in classroom literature programs from class to class and from school to school are as wide as the NEATE study, especially, suggests, then the English profession might well wish to consider how the extremes of individualism might be mitigated. Although parents, other interested citizens, school committee members, and other educators or public officials should have some voice in public discussions of this issue, secondary school English teachers should have a major voice. And they might well begin their considerations by examining the Paideia Program itself, whose advisory

members included such well-known figures in the field of education as Theodore Sizer and Ernest Boyer. It contains the richest and broadest multicultural array of authors and titles I have yet to see.

Publishers, too, need to be brought into a public discussion of what literature programs in the schools should look like. In light of the vast changes that have taken place in the secondary school curriculum over this century insofar as major titles are concerned, we need full and open discussion on how teachers and educational publishers might best maintain coherent intellectual connections between our culture's past and present and among all those who inhabit our civic communities today and at the same time provide for individual variations from class to class, school to school, and community to community that reflect differing social interests.

References

Adler, Mortimer. The Paideia Program. New York: Macmillan, 1984.

Anderson, Scarvia. Between the Grimms and "The Group:" Literature in American High Schools. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1964.

Applebee, Arthur. A Study of Book-Length Works Taught in High School English Courses. Report Series 1.2. University of Albany, New York: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature, 1989.

Applebee, Arthur, Judith Langer, and Ina Mullis. Literature and U.S. History: The Instructional Experience and Factual Knowledge of High School Juniors. Report No. 17-HL-01. National Assessment of Educational Progress. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1987.

Barrs, James T. Suggested Precollege Reading. 3rd edition. Lexington, MA: New England Association of Teachers of English, 1981.

Hirsch, E.D. Jr. Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs To Know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Norvell, G. The Reading Interests of Young People. Boston: D.C. Heath, 1950.

Ravitch, Diane, & Finn, Chester. What Do Our 17-Year Olds Know? New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Stotsky, Sandra, Philip Anderson, with David Beierl. Variety and Individualism in the English Class: Teacher-Recommended Lists of Reading for Grades 7-12. Pull-out section in The Leaflet, 89 (3), Fall 1990, 1-11.

Tanner, George. Report of the committee appointed by the English Conference to inquire into the teaching of English in the high schools of the middle west. School Review, 1907, 15, 37-45.

Table 1: A Reproduction of Table II in Tanner, 1907

TABLE II

SHOWING BY YEARS THE NUMBER OF SCHOOLS IN WHICH BOOKS ARE READ

(Total Number of Schools, 67)

TITLE OF BOOK	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS					TITLE OF BOOK	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS				
	1st Yr.	2d Yr.	3d Yr.	4th Yr.	T		1st Yr.	2d Yr.	3d Yr.	4th Yr.	T
*Julius Caesar†	7	30	10	5	61	*Irving's Goldsmith	2	8	5	1	16
*Macbeth†	1	9	28	23	61	Burns' Poems		3	7	5	15
*Silas Marner†	9	30	12	7	58	Poe—Selections †	7	5	2	1	15
*Milton's Minor Poems†		3	16	38	57	Vicar of Wakefield†	3	6	3	3	15
*Merchant of Venice†	12	29	10	3	54	Twice Told Tales	7	4	2		13
*Burke's Conciliation†		1	16	34	51	House of the Seven Gables †	5	2	4	1	12
*Vision of Sir Launfal†	24	11	12	1	48	Last of the Mohicans	9	2		1	12
*Ancient Mariner†	8	16	15	7	46	Wordsworth—Selections	1	1	5	5	12
*Ivanhoe†	16	20	5	1	42	Deserted Village†	3	5	1	2	11
*Macaulay's Addison		4	13	25	42	Sohrab and Rustum†	2	7	1	1	11
*Sir Roger de Coverley†	3	14	14	10	41	Paradise Lost, I–II			2	8	10
*Idylls of the King†	3	13	16	8	39	Snow-Bound	8	2			10
*Lady of the Lake†	16	15	3		34	Tales of the White Hills	9			1	10
Macaulay's Milton		1	6	25	32	Marmion	2	6			8
Chaucer's Prologue†		3	13	15	31	Pope's Homer's Iliad	5	2		1	8
Sketch Book†	23	3	2	1	29	Tales of a Wayside Inn	7				7
Carlyle's Burns†		1	11	10	22	Browning—Selections †.			1	5	6
Hamlet		1	3	18	22	Tale of Two Cities †	2	3		1	6
*Macaulay's Johnson†		1	11	10	22	King Lear				5	5
Princess		3	7	12	22	Treasure Island	1	2			3
As You Like It†	2	7	4	3	16						

* College Entrance Requirements, 1906–8.

† College Entrance Requirements, 1909–11.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2: The 42 Books Most Frequently Taught in 5% or More of Public Schools in Grades 7-12 in Anderson, 1964*

	222 Schools	7121 Classes
	% Schools	% Classes
As You Like It--Shakespeare	9	1
Barretts of Wimpole Street--Besier	8	1
The Bridge of San Luis Rey--Wilder	13	3
Call of the Wild--London	8	2
Christmas Carol--Dickens	16	3
Cyrano de Bergerac--Rostand	9	2
David Copperfield--Dickens	18	2
Ethan Frome--Wharton	8	2
Evangeline--Longfellow	22	3
Great Expectations--Dickens	39	6
Hamlet--Shakespeare	33	5
House of Seven Gables--Hawthorne	11	1
Huckleberry Finn--Twain	27	4
Idylls of the King--Tennyson	23	3
Ivanhoe--Scott	21	3
Jane Eyre--Bronte	10	1
Johnny Tremaine--Forbes	11	3
Julius Caesar--Shakespeare	77	15
King and I--Rodgers & Hammerstein	13	2
Macbeth--Shakespeare	90	12
Merchant of Venice--Shakepeare	21	4
Midsummer Night's Dream--Shakespeare	10	2
Moby Dick--Melville	18	2
Odyssey--Homer	27	5
Old Man and the Sea--Hemingway	12	2
Our Town--Wilder	46	9
Paradise Lost--Milton	13	1
Pearl--Steinbeck	15	3
Pride and Prejudice--Austin	12	2
Pygmalion--Shaw	23	2
Red Badge of Courage--Crane	33	6
Return of the Native--Hardy	16	3
Romeo and Juliet--Shakespeare	14	3
Scarlet Letter--Hawthorne	32	5
She Stoops to Conquer--Goldsmith	9	1
Silas Morner--Eliot	76	14
Tale of Two Cities--Dickens	33	6
To Kill a Mockingbird--Lee	8	1
Tom Sawyer--Twain	10	1
Treasure Island--Stevenson	20	3
Walden--Thoreau	10	1
Yearling--Rawlings	13	4

.....

*Excerpted from Table 1.

Table 3: The 43 Books Most Frequently Taught in 5% or More of Public Schools, Grades 7-12, in Applebee, 1989*

	322 Schools
	% Schools
1984--Orwell	28
Animal Farm--Orwell	51
Antigone--Sophocles	28
Call of the Wild--London	51
Catcher in the Rye--Salinger	26
Christmas Carol--Dickens	20
Crucible--Miller	47
Day No Pigs Would Die--Peck	22
Death of a Salesman--Miller	36
Diary of a Young Girl--Frank	56
Fahrenheit 451--Bradbury	20
Glass Menagerie--Williams	24
Grapes of Wrath--Steinbeck	28
Great Expectations--Dickens	44
Great Gatsby--Fitzgerald	54
Hamlet--Shakespeare	56
Huckleberry Finn--Twain	78
Johnny Tremain--Forbes	21
Julius Caesar--Shakespeare	71
Light in the Forest--Richter	24
Lord of the Flies--Golding	56
Macbeth--Shakespeare	81
Miracle Worker--Gibson	32
Odyssey--Homer	29
Oedipus Rex--Sophocles	21
Of Mice and Men--Steinbeck	60
Othello--Shakespeare	20
Our Town--Wilder	44
Outsiders--Hinton	39
Pearl--Steinbeck	64
Pigman--Zindel	38
Pygmalion--Shaw	21
Red Badge of Courage--Crane	47
Red Pony--Steinbeck	31
Romeo and Juliet--Shakespeare	90
Scarlet Letter--Hawthorne	62
Separate Peace--Knowles	48
Shane--Shaefer	28
Tale of Two Cities--Dickens	41
To Kill a Mockingbird--Lee	74
Tom Sawyer--Twain	32
Where the Red Fern Grows--Rawls	21
Wuthering Heights--Bronte	26

*Excerpted from Appendix 2.

Table 4: The 45 Titles Most Frequently Recommended by NEATE Members, Grades 7-12, in Stotsky and Anderson, 1990*

RANK	TITLE	AUTHOR	NUMBER OF NOMINATIONS
3	ADVENTURES OF HUCKLEBERRY FINN, THE	MARK TWAIN	32
17	ANIMAL FARM	GEORGE ORWELL	15
32	BLACK BOY	RICHARD WRIGHT	9
36	CALL OF THE WILD	JACK LONDON	8
1	CATCHER IN THE RYE	J. D. SALINGER	35
15	CRUCIBLE, THE	ARTHUR MILLER	16
22	CRY, THE BELOVED COUNTRY	ALAN PATON	12
19	DAY NO PIGS WOULD DIE, A	ROBERT NEWTON PECK	13
11	DEATH OF A SALESMAN	ARTHUR MILLER	20
22	DIARY OF A YOUNG GIRL, THE	ANNE FRANK	12
19	ETHAN FROME	EDITH WHARTON	13
30	FLOWERS FOR ALGERNON	DANIEL KEYES	10
32	GLASS MENAGERIE, THE	TENNESSEE WILLIAMS	9
13	GRAPES OF WRATH, THE	JOHN STEINBECK	17
22	GREAT EXPECTATIONS	CHARLES DICKENS	12
3	GREAT GATSBY, THE	F. SCOTT FITZGERALD	32
12	HAMLET	WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE	19
32	HEART OF DARKNESS	JOSEPH CONRAD	9
36	I KNOW WHY THE CAGED BIRD SINGS	MAYA ANGELOU	8
19	JANE EYRE	CHARLOTTE BRONTE	13
36	JOHNNY TREMAIN	ESTHER FORBES	8
30	JULIUS CAESAR	WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE	10
9	LORD OF THE FLIES	WILLIAM GOLDING	24
5	MACBETH	WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE	28
13	NIGHT	ELIE WIESEL	17
36	OEDIPUS REX	SOPHOCLES	8
6	OF MICE AND MEN	JOHN STEINBECK	27
26	OLD MAN AND THE SEA, THE	ERNEST HEMINGWAY	11
36	ONE FLEW OVER THE CUCKOO'S NEST	KEN KESEY	8
32	OUR TOWN	THORNTON WILDER	9
26	OUTSIDERS, THE	S. E. HINTON	11
15	PEARL, THE	JOHN STEINBECK	16
36	PIGMAN, THE	PAUL ZINDEL	8
26	RAISIN IN THE SUN, A	LORRAINE HANSBERRY	11
36	RED BADGE OF COURAGE, THE	STEPHEN CRANE	8
26	ROLL OF THUNDER HEAR MY CRY	MILDRED TAYLOR	11
8	ROMEO AND JULIET	WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE	26
6	SCARLET LETTER, THE	NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE	27
9	SEPARATE PEACE, A	JOHN KNOWLES	24
36	SILAS MARNER	GEORGE ELIOT	8
36	STREETCAR NAMED DESIRE, A	TENNESSEE WILLIAMS	8
18	TALE OF TWO CITIES, A	CHARLES DICKENS	14
22	THEIR EYES WERE WATCHING GOD	ZORA NEALE HURSTON	12
1	TO KILL A MOCKINGBIRD	HARPER LEE	35
36	WUTHERING HEIGHTS	EMILY BRONTE	8

*Derived from data collected in the NEATE survey.